

remarks/arguments

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Riko et al (hereinafter JP '327) in view of Toshiba Corp. (hereinafter JP '489); Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP '327 in view of JP '489 and further in view of Hymans; Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP '327 in view of JP '489 and Niigata (hereinafter JP '063) and Chabrier; and Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by JP '489. Claims 1-13 remain active.

Considering first then the rejection of Claims 1-6 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP '327 in view of JP '489, it is to be noted that Claim 1 has now been amended to specify that the cage includes a first and second pair of opposed corner portions and has a chamfered portion at each corner portion of the cage. In addition, Claim 1 calls for the car frame to have a vertical column arranged along chamfered portions of the first pair of opposed corner portions and as rope connecting portions along the second pair of opposed corner portions. The advantage of these structural members is emphasized in the specification in that it is possible to achieve a reduction in the installation space for the elevator apparatus in terms of the width direction of the car, thereby enabling a further reduction in hoistway space, as emphasized at page 14 of the application. In addition, the chamfered portions, being provided at the four corners of the cage permit the car and counterweight to pass each other within a narrow hoistway as that air can be released through spaces formed by the chamfered portions to thereby make it possible to prevent an impact sound or vibration from being generated as the car and the counterweight pass each other, as emphasized at page 16, lines 1-7.

Contrary to the present invention as now claimed, neither JP '327 nor JP '489 teach or disclose the above-noted combination of limitations claimed in Claim 1. In this regard, it is noted that JP '327 is, as admitted by the Examiner, silent with respect to a teaching of a car frame having a vertical column disposed along each of first and second chamfered portions. While JP '489 has been cited as teaching first and second columns disposed along chamfered portions, such reference only teaches a single pair of chamfered portions and does not teach the combination of a vertical column arranged along chamfered portions along a first pair of opposed corner portions and rope connecting portions along a second pair of opposed corner portions. More particularly, the opposed corner portions, one of which is designated by reference number 45 in JP '327, have no disclosed function other than that as illustrated enclosing the cage. There is also no suggestion of the structure of JP '489 providing the advantages noted above in accordance with the present invention. In view of the foregoing, and in view of the fact that none of the remaining references of record teach or disclose limitations now added to Claim 1, it is submitted that Claim 1 patentably defines over the prior art of record.

Each of dependent Claims 2-12 contain additional limitations which, it is submitted, have no corresponding teaching or disclosure in the above-noted references. In view of these limitations and in view of the dependency of these claims either directly or indirectly upon Claim 1, it is submitted that Claims 2-12 also merit indication of allowability.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP '327 in view of JP '489 and Hymans and the rejection of Claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP '327 in view of JP '489 and JP '063 and Chabrier, it is submitted that neither Hymans nor JP '063 or Chabrier rectify the deficiencies noted hereinabove with regard to the prior art utilized to reject Claim 1.

Lastly considering then the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by JP '489, it is noted that Claim 13 has been amended to claim that a protrusion is formed inside the case due to the provision of the recess provided in a side face of the cage. Insofar as no corresponding structure is provided in JP '327 and in view of the advantages provided by the structural arrangement as explained in the specification, it is submitted that Claim 13 patentably defines over JP '327 as well as all of the remaining references of record.

In view of the foregoing, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:JDH\la



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599

James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421
Attorneys of Record